


Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/807,680	EIDELMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vincent P. Barth	2877	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 16 June 2004.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 16-31,35-39,42,70-73,89-113,115-131 and 147-178.
3. ☒ The drawings filed on 04 September 2001 are accepted by the Examiner.
4. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

5. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
 6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).**
7. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____ | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance |
| | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Preliminary Comments

1. Applicant's Amendments dated 16 June 2004 have placed the Application in a condition for allowance as written. Accordingly, the following represents a reasoned statement for allowability.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 16-31, 35-39, 42, 70-73, 89-113, 115-131 and 147-178 are allowable, since the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations set forth therein.

3. Referring to Claim 16, the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations whereby a system for inspecting a fpd comprises a staring array optical sensor with an illumination subsystem sequentially providing dark and bright field illumination of the fpd, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claim. Claims 17-31, 35-39 and 42 are allowable based on their dependency upon the claim from which each is dependent. Referring to Claim 70, the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations whereby a device for inspecting a substantially planar surface comprises an illuminator configured to selectably illuminate a substantially planar surface, a first configuration providing dark field illumination and a second configuration providing bright field illumination, and an image analysis subsystem for detecting anomalies in the surface as a function of variations in reflected intensity of

Art Unit: 2877

illumination, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claim. Claims 71 and 72 are allowable based on their dependency upon the claim from which each is dependent. Referring to Claim 73, the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations whereby a device for coating a substantially planar surface comprises an illuminator configured to selectably illuminate a substantially planar surface, a first configuration providing dark field illumination and a second configuration providing bright field illumination, and an image analysis subsystem for detecting anomalies in the surface as a function of variations in reflected intensity of illumination, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claim. Referring to Claim 89, the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations whereby a method for inspecting a fpd comprises viewing the substrate using a staring array optical sensor with an illumination subsystem sequentially providing dark and bright field illumination of the fpd, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claim. Claims 90-99 and 147-178 are allowable based on their dependency upon the claim from which each is dependent. Referring to Claim 100, the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations whereby a method for inspecting a surface comprises viewing a first location using a staring array optical sensor with an illumination subsystem sequentially providing dark and bright field illumination of the object and repeating the operation to comprise substantially the entire object, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claim. Claims 101-109 are allowable based on their dependency upon the claim from which each is dependent. Referring to Claim 110, the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations whereby a method for inspecting a

Art Unit: 2877

substantially planar surface comprises sequentially illuminating a substantially planar surface, a first configuration providing dark field illumination and a second configuration providing bright field illumination, and analyzing the images and detecting anomalies in the surface as a function of variations in reflected intensity of illumination, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claim. Claims 111 and 112 are allowable based on their dependency upon the claim from which each is dependent. Referring to Claim 113, the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations whereby a method for coating a substantially planar surface comprises sequentially illuminating a substantially planar surface, a first configuration providing dark field illumination and a second configuration providing bright field illumination, and analyzing the images and detecting anomalies in the surface as a function of variations in reflected intensity of illumination, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claim. Referring to Claim 115, the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations whereby a method for inspecting a surface comprises viewing a portion of the surface using a staring array optical sensor with an illumination subsystem sequentially providing dark and bright field illumination of the object and repeating the operation to comprise substantially the entire object, and analyzing the non-uniformities in the reflected intensities, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claim. Claims 116-130 are allowable based on their dependency upon the claim from which each is dependent. Claim 131, the prior art references, either considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or render obvious the limitations whereby a method for coating a surface with a film comprises depositing the film coating on the surface, viewing a portion of the surface using a staring array optical sensor with an illumination subsystem

Art Unit: 2877

sequentially providing dark and bright field illumination of the object and repeating the operation to comprise substantially the entire object, and analyzing the non-uniformities in the reflected intensities, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claim.

Comments


4. Applicants have amended claims previously rejected pursuant to §112 in an appropriate manner, and which is clear from the Remarks dated 16 June 2004 included in the Amendment pertaining thereto. For example, the term “non-scanning optical array” has been replaced by “staring array”, and the term “of a similar order” has been deleted. Moreover, Applicants’ discussion (Remarks pg. 19, first full para.) have appropriately addressed the Examiner’s concerns relating to the term “no orders of diffraction”, indicating that the a reasonable construction of the term is that none of the diffraction orders impinge on the sensor, but rather, impinge elsewhere. Accordingly, all of the rejections pursuant to §112 are withdrawn.

5. Applicants have appropriately amended Claims 169 and 42, in response to the Comments by the Examiner in the previous Office Action. Accordingly, said claims are allowable as amended.

Art Unit: 2877

CONCLUSION

6. Applicants' Claims 16-31, 35-39, 42, 70-73, 89-113, 115-131 and 147-178 are allowed based on the reasons set forth above.
7. Applicants have canceled Claims 1-15, 32-34, 40, 41, 43-69, 74-88, 114 and 132-146.
8. Any inquiries concerning this communication from the Examiner should be directed to Vincent P. Barth, whose telephone number is 571-272-2410, and who may be ordinarily reached from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. The official fax number for communications to the group is 703-872-9306.
9. If attempts to reach the Examiner prove unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor is Frank G. Font, who may be reached at 571-272-2415.
10. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.



Richard A. Rosenberger
Primary Examiner